

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10, 12-16, 18-21, and 24-27 were previously pending in the application. Claims 25 and 27 are canceled, claims 1 and 9 are amended, and new claims 28-30 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-10, 12-16, 18-21, 24, 26, and 28-30 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim 24

On line 4 of the PTOL-326 form, the Examiner failed to indicate that claim 24 was pending in the application.

Claim Rejections and Allowable Subject Matter

On page 2 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-15, 18-19, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beamish in view of Brueske and in further view of Younis. On page 8, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beamish in view of Brueske in view of Younis and further view of Lin. On page 9, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beamish in view of Brueske in view of Younis in further view of Hess. On page 10, the Examiner stated that "Claims 8, 16, 20, 25, 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim," but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Since (i) the PTOL-326 form indicated that claim 27 was objected to, (ii) claim 26 was rejected on page 2, and (iii) the subject matter of claim 27 is similar to that of allowable claim 25, the Applicant assumes that the Examiner intended to indicate the allowability of the subject matter of claim 27, not claim 26 on page 10. The Applicant requests clarification from the Examiner if this assumption is not correct. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all of the now-pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of previously pending claim 25. As such, currently amended claim 1 is equivalent to previously pending claim 25 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that currently amended claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 9 has been amended to include the features of previously pending claim 27. As such, currently amended claim 9 is equivalent to previously pending claim 27 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that currently amended claim 9 is allowable.

New claim 28 is equivalent to previously pending claim 8 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 28 is allowable.

New claim 29 is equivalent to previously pending claim 20 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 29 is allowable.

New claim 30 is equivalent to previously pending claim 16 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 30 is allowable.

Since the rest of the claims depend variously from claims 1 and 9, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims under Section 103(a) have been overcome. In addition, new claims 28-30 patentably define over the cited references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Fees

During the pendency of this application, the Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment of any filing fees for presentation of extra claims under 37 CFR 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Mendelsohn, Drucker, & Associates, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-0782.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time if not submitted with the reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 08/04/2009
Customer No. 22186
Mendelsohn, Drucker, & Associates, P.C.
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/Steve Mendelsohn/
Steve Mendelsohn
Registration No. 35,951
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 557-6657 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)